

It is easier to describe than to review this book, which contains a selection from the replies to a questionnaire circulated by UNESCO to distinguished thinkers and writers in the member states. There are four appendixes: the text of the questionnaire; the conclusions reached by UNESCO after consideration of the replies; the Declaration of Human Rights subsequently issued by the United Nations; and an index of the contributors, thirty men and one woman.

Tot homines quot sententiae! The high quality of the thought is in exasperating contrast with the diversity of the opinions. No one goes quite so far as to equate wants with needs and needs with rights, and no one confines his conclusions to the rights which should be established and protected here and now. Even those who make rights conditional on the performance of duties are conscious of the danger of allowing those who define the duties to deny the rights. And, except by way of example, no one attempts to indicate the duties. As rights may conflict, an order of priority would be desirable, or, better still, a plan for blending rights, without carrying any right to its logical extreme. The rights which it might be practicable to assure to some people today are very different from the rights for all people which form an ultimate goal in a remote future. It is hardly too cynical to say that everyone is ready to make any concessions about the future as long as he is committed to nothing much in the present. For example, Article 28 of the United Nations Declaration states: "Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully recognized."

The supreme contradiction is that the national state which on occasion inflicts cruelty and denies justice, which disregards the rights of other states, and which refuses to recognize the paramount rights of humanity except in empty declarations which it knows it cannot be called upon to honor is still holding itself out as part of this social and international order.

If it is hard for the ordinary reader to rise to the intellectual and moral level of the philosophers, many of them have found it hard to sympathize with the man who wants to see an end put to active inhumanity (including slavery, torture, and perhaps even war); who wants a larger real income; who wants to retain his existing privileges but to destroy what he regards as the excessive privileges of others. Such a man is more concerned with the rights which

it is expedient to create than with the rights which it is expedient to declare. He may be concerned with philosophy as well, for he has to go on living without the rights he needs.

H. F. ANGUS

University of British Columbia

Language of Politics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics. By HAROLD D. LASSWELL, NATHAN LEITES, and ASSOCIATES. New York: George W. Stewart, Inc., 1949. Pp. vii+398. \$5.75.

The *Language of Politics* has three parts: an introductory discussion on theory by Harold D. Lasswell, a section on techniques in content analysis, and a presentation of applications of these techniques. The materials presented in the two latter sections are largely a republication, in somewhat revised form, of papers prepared by the Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communication at the Library of Congress.

The three chapters by Lasswell deal with the language of power, style in the language of politics, and the usefulness of quantitative methods in the analysis of political discourse. These introductory materials, a series of discrete essays, were apparently not intended to provide any systematic theoretical framework for content analysis. They are well written and provocative, however, and the discussion, "Why Be Quantitative?" is especially interesting.

After this promising introduction, the materials themselves, which deal with technique and applications, are disappointing. The material on technique will undoubtedly prove useful to persons working in the field of content analysis. The best techniques, however, must still be evaluated in terms of the rationale of the problems to which they are applied.

It is in the presentation of particular studies that the *Language of Politics* is most disappointing. The chapters of application deal with separate problems, and the hypotheses used in the plan of these studies are rarely given. In his Introduction Lasswell points out that quantitative methods in political analysis make possible objective procedures in the discovering of propaganda themes, etc. In the presentation of the illustrative materials, however, there is no statement as to why one theme rather than another was selected for analysis. No clear statement is available of how an objective selection can be made among the items which comprise a universe of content.

Certain of the chapters on application attempt to use quantitative methods in the analysis of interaction. Chapter xi deals with the interaction of factions within the Third International. Chapter xii deals with the response of Communist propaganda to Communist setbacks. In these chapters the writers substitute quantitative indexes for what they consider to be pertinent variables. Many of the indexes employed can best be described as naïve. Again, no reason is given why these indexes rather than other indexes have been selected by the authors. Further, the language of these two chapters seems unnecessarily complicated.

Sociologists interested in methods in the social sciences may find it a useful exercise to read the introductory chapters of this volume and attempt to reconcile them with the material that follows.

ETHEL SHANAS

University of Chicago

Industrial and Occupational Trends in National Employment, 1910-1940, 1910-1948. By GLADYS L. PALMER and ANN RATNER. (Research Report No. 11.) Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1949. Pp. ix+68. \$1.00.

This technically component and analytically ingenious report emphasizes changes between 1910 and 1940 in (1) the industrial and occupational distribution of national employment, both total employment and that of women; (2) the occupational composition of industries; and (3) the industrial composition of occupations. (Some 1910-48 comparisons are also made.) The study differs from earlier related ones in that the data are presented in terms of the 1940 classification of occupations and industries and relate to *employment* rather than gainful workers and the labor force. In addition, the authors have attempted, by a standardization procedure, to minimize the effect of population and employment level changes between 1910 and 1940 in interpreting the findings.

To effect comparability with employment data for 1940, several types of adjustments were made in the original census data, the basic assumptions of which are carefully and explicitly stated and the details of which are presented less adequately.

In addition to the detailed and numerous findings, of particular interest are the analyses

and the techniques of measuring factors contributing to the difference in employment levels in 1910 and 1940 and changes in the occupational pattern of employment in 1940 attributable to changes in the 1910 structure of employment. Here the authors have made a real contribution to the advance of analytical techniques in labor-force studies.

The study is a fine example of what may be done in labor-force research beyond the obvious descriptive level.

ELEANOR H. BERNERT

New York City

Varieties of Delinquent Youth. By WILLIAM H. SHELDON. New York: Harper & Bros., 1949. Pp. xvii+899. \$8.00.

The many themes and subthemes of this contribution, all of them very intriguing but some fanciful, make a review difficult. Sheldon's verbosity, as he says himself, is Dionysian; his ideas, Promethean. But this is not meant to be a final diagnosis.

Sheldon's contribution consists of two hundred condensed biographies, of youths studied at the Hayden Goodwill Inn, a hostel and rehabilitation center for transient, problem, and delinquent youths in Boston during 1939 and 1942. Each abbreviated biography covers the morphological description (including the somatype), temperament, known delinquencies, origins and family, mental history and achievement, medical history, the running record, summary, and an index of delinquency or disappointingness.

Each case is quantified in an Index of Delinquency, which is summed into "Total D." The Index of Delinquency or Disappointingness (!) includes mental insufficiency, medical insufficiency, psychotic inappropriateness, psychoneurotic inappropriateness, cerebrophobic delinquency (alcoholism and other drug addiction), gynandrophrenic delinquency (femininity in the male), and residual delinquency (known delinquencies). These items are given ratings by methods which more careful statisticians would call dubious. The ratings are diagnostic, in increasing order of seriousness.

A Total D of 10, according to Sheldon, means that there is no hope that the delinquent will get along outside a hospital or prison; 9 is a very poor prognosis also, indicating institutionalization; 8 is gravely doubtful; 7 is border line; 6 is